

REMARKS

The allowability of claims 19, 20, 44, 45, 57 and 58, if made independent of rejected claims and including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, has been noted. These claims have been amended accordingly. In particular, the substance of claim 1 and claim 28 has been added to claims 19 and 44, respectively, so that claims 19 and 44 are now independent with all the limitations of their base claims. The same is true for claims 57 and 58 which have been made independent by adding thereto the features of claims 52 and 1, respectively, from which claims 57 and 58 depended.


No changes seemed necessary for claims 20 and 45 as these depended from claim 19 and claim 44, respectively. Minor formal changes have, however, been made in claim 20 which are thought to be clarifying. In view of the above-noted amendments, claims 19, 20, 44, 45, 57 and 58 are believed to be allowable.

With respect to the Examiner's Section 112, 2nd ¶ rejection, claim 22 has been canceled without prejudice and claim 49 has been amended to make it clear that, as in claim 24, the polymer referred to is the one used to provide the coating on the outer surface of the shell wall. These changes are thought to obviate the basis for the Examiner's Section 112, 2nd ¶ rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Section 112, 2nd ¶ rejection is requested.

The Examiner's Section 103(a) rejection has been obviated by canceling claims 1, 28 and 52 and amending the remaining claims to depend, directly or indirectly, from either claims 19, 44 or 57, each of which has been indicated to be allowable.

As amended, the application is thought to be in condition for allowance and such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By 
Paul N. Kokulis
Reg. No. 16773

Date: July 15, 2009

Customer No. 09629
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Phone: (202) 739-3000
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001
Direct: (202) 739-5455